

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 40-44 have been allowed.

Claims 1-6, 9-14, 17-25, 28-34 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Schmeidler et al. The office action asserts a new ground of rejection, but appears to cite the exact same sections of the Chan reference for allegedly teaching, determining a digital signature verification error based on a received message header identifier associated with a public key certificate identifier and generating a digital signature verification map containing a plurality of acceptable message header identifiers. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Chan does not teach such operations. Also, the office action again does not address Applicant's position with respect to the Chan reference nor to the showings requested by Applicant in the previous response. If the rejection is maintained, Applicant again respectfully requests a showing in Chan as to: a) which data in the cited reference corresponds to the received message header identifier associated with a public key certificate identifier; b) the digital signature of what entity is being verified; c) which entity performs the digital signature verification and; d) what entity, based on an error detection, performs the step of generating a digital signature verification map as claimed. None of these limitations appear to be taught in the Chan reference and as such, the claims are in condition for allowance.

Chan is directed to a system that can protect against unruly executable content that is downloaded, for example, from the Internet (see for example, page 1, paragraph 5). The Chan reference does not appear to teach or suggest the claimed method or apparatus since among other things, it does not appear to determine a digital signature verification error, such as verifying a

digital signature of a certificate based on received message header identifier associated with a public key certificate identifier as required in the claim.

The cited portion of the Chan reference (page 8, 2nd column, 3rd paragraph and page 9, 1st column, 1st paragraph and page 10, 1st column, 2nd paragraph) is not directed to a digital signature verification process or to the detection of an error based on a digital signature verification process that is based on received message header identifier associated with a public key certificate identifier. Instead, the cited portion refers to a calling process being checked to see if it is restricted by an appropriate restricted security identifier in a token. As best understood, this process does not appear to be performed by a digital signing verification process that is based on a received message header ID that is associated with a public key certificate identifier as required by the claim. In fact, it does not appear that the described token is digitally signed nor does it appear that a message header identifier that is associated with a public key certificate identifier is used in any digital signature verification process. As such, the claims are in condition for allowance.

In addition, the reference also appears to fail to teach generating a digital signature verification map as claimed. The office action cites to page 8, 1st column, 3rd paragraph and page 9, 2nd column, 3rd and 4th paragraphs. However, as best understood, paragraph 82 of the cited reference describes for example, that a URL string is converted to a restricted security ID through a one-way cryptographic hash function to convert the URL stream to a restricted security identifier by adding a header indicating that the number is a security ID identifier and how the number was generated. This portion describes generating a security identifier. There is no digital signature verification map that includes a plurality of acceptable message header identifiers that is associated with a public key certificate identifier. In fact, it does not appear

that any digital signature verification operation is described in the cited portions, nor is there a reference to a plurality of acceptable message header identifiers that are contained in a digital signature map as required by the claim. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance based on this reason also.

The Schmeidler reference has allegedly been cited for teaching what Chan lacks. However, Schmeidler only appears to be cited as teaching that a digital signature is associated with a corresponding public key. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the Patent Office appears to be selectively dissecting the claim in a manner that fails to address the claim language properly. In any event, Chan fails to teach the subject matter for which is has been cited and therefore the claims are allowable.

Moreover, the motivation given in the office action appears to be irrelevant to the claimed invention as the motivation for combining the teachings Chan and Schmeidler is that one would combine the references to protect the value of the content and prevent unauthorized use and copying of the content. However, the claims are directed instead to an apparatus and method for providing information security where a received message header identifier is used to determine if a digital signature verification error has occurred and also generating a digital signature verification map that contains a plurality of acceptable message header identifiers for the public key certificate identifier. As described in Applicant's specification, Applicant's apparatus and method can overcome a problem in which an attacker may change a transport header indicating that a message is coming from a different source, not to preventing unauthorized copying of content as described in the Schmeidler reference. Accordingly, claims 1 and 10 are in condition for allowance.

As to independent claim 17, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim has not been rejected as claim language in this claim has not been addressed in the office action. For example, claim 17 requires, among other things, “updating a digital signature verification map to add an acceptable message header identifier associated with a public key certificate identifier”. Updating such a verification map to add an acceptable message header language has not been addressed in the office action nor can Applicant find such an operation in the cited references. Accordingly, this claim is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

As to claim 20, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1 and as such this claim is also in condition for allowance.

As to claim 29, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1 and as such this claim is also in condition for allowance.


Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Schmeidler as applied to claims 1, 10, 20 and 29 and further in view of Cooper et al. As a preliminary matter, Applicant again respectfully submits that this claim is in condition for allowance as the office action adds limitations into the claim that are not present. For example, with respect to claim 38, the office action alleges that Chan discloses “determination of a digital signature verification error” whereas claim 38 does not include this language. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that a prima facie showing of obviousness has not been presented and as such, the claim is in condition for allowance. In addition, the office action admits that Chan does not describe a trusted alias map and alleges that Cooper teaches such a mechanism. However, Cooper is also silent as to generating a trusted alias map containing the plurality of acceptable message identifiers in at least one associated subject alias. Accordingly, this claim is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter and Applicant respectfully reasserts relevant remarks made with respect to the dependent claims made in previous office actions.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3-15-05

By:   
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P. C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, IL 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005  
E-MAIL: creckamp@vedderprice.com